REMARKS

The present application was filed on June 14, 2001 with claims 1 through 59. Claims 25-29, 40-44, and 55-59 were cancelled due to a restriction requirement. Claims 1-18, 30-37, and 45-52 were cancelled in the Voluntary Amendment dated June 29, 2006. Claims 19-24, 38, 39, 53, and 54 are presently pending in the above-identified patent application. Claims 19 and 53 are proposed to be amended herein.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 19 and 53 due to indicated informalities. The Examiner rejected claims 19-21, 39, and 53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. (United States Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0157103A1) in view of Barton et al. (United States Patent Number 6,744,915 B1). The Examiner has indicated that claims 22, 23, 39, and 54 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicants note that the Examiner has rejected claim 39, and has indicated that claim 39 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Formal Objections

Claims 19 and 53 were objected to due to indicated informalities. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the preambles are too general and unclear.

Claims 19 and 53 have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns and Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 19 and 53 be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 19, 38, and 53

Independent claims 19 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. in view of Barton et al. Regarding claim 19, the Examiner asserts that Song teaches creating a plurality of levels (dividing into segments) for the media content (multimedia presentation), and periodically transmitting (in periodic transmission process) each level (segments) (FIG. 1; page 2, paragraphs [0011-0013]). The Examiner acknowledges that Song does not expressly disclose "determining original stroke data from a whiteboard and for each of a plurality of levels of detail, determining predicted stroke data from the original stroke," but asserts that Barton teaches determining original stroke data from a whiteboard (col. 1, lines 54-67); and for each of a plurality of levels of detail, determining predicted stroke data from the original

stroke data (FIG. 5; col. 9, lines 51-63).

Applicants note that the present disclosure teaches that "the levels segment the media and allow the media to be examined with ***details that range from coarse to fine or examined with varying importance or both***" (Page 3, lines 22-24; emphasis added) As the Examiner acknowledges, Song teaches to divide media content into segments. Regarding the segments, Song teaches that "these various segments of digital content together may make up a movie. These segments are preferably non-overlapping, and each of their sizes can be arbitrary, although quite often they are made equal length in time." (Paragraph 0008) Song does not, however, disclose or suggest levels (as defined in the present invention) that are based on ***details that range from coarse to fine, or based on varying importance, or both.*** Independent claims 19, 38, and 53, as amended, require for each of a plurality of levels of detail, determining predicted stroke data from the original stroke data; and periodically transmitting the predicted stroke data for each level of detail.

Applicants also note that Barton is directed to an image identification apparatus (see, Abstract.) In the text cited by the Examiner, Barton teaches that

> the estimates of the strokes which make up the hand drawn representation are fed from the first and second segment estimators 114, 116 to the segmenter 118. The segmenter 118 processes the estimates from the relative direction analysis and the speed analysis, which are compared and combined and a list produced of the locations where the gesture should be segmented into separate stokes. The segmentation into strokes is then performed from which the stroke data is produced at the connecting channel 34 which is fed to the stroke pre-processor 24. Also fed to the stroke pre-processor 24 from the cache memory unit 100 via the connecting channel 32 are the spatial samples which corresponds to the hand drawn image.
> (Col. 9, lines 51-63.)

Barton does not, however, disclose or suggest levels (as defined in the present invention) that are based on ***details that range from coarse to fine, or based on varying importance, or both,*** and does not disclose or suggest ***periodically transmitting the predicted stroke data for each level of detail.***

In addition, since Song is directed to the segmentation of a multimedia presentation, and does not address the issue of levels of media content, and since Barton is directed to an image identification apparatus and does not address the issue of levels of

media content, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the cited references.

Thus, Song et al. and Barton et al., alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, for each of a plurality of levels of detail, determining predicted stroke data from the original stroke data; and periodically transmitting the predicted stroke data for each level of detail, as required by independent claims 19, 38, and 53, as amended.

Dependent Claims 20-24, 39, and 54

Dependent claims 20-21 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al. in view of Barton et al.

Claims 20-24, 39, and 54 are dependent on claims 19, 38, and 53, respectively, and are therefore patentably distinguished over Song et al. and Barton et al., alone or in combination, because of their dependency from independent claims 19, 38, and 53 for the reasons set forth above, as well as other elements these claims add in combination to their base claim. The Examiner has already indicated that claims 22, 23, 39, and 54 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

All of the pending claims following entry of the amendments, i.e., claims 19-24, 38-39, and 53-54, are in condition for allowance and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

If any outstanding issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Examiner's attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin M. Mason

Date: December 20, 2006

Kevin M. Mason
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 36,597
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
1300 Post Road, Suite 205
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 255-6560